

### **REMARKS**

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 11 to 14, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 24 to 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Berg, U.S. Patent No. 3,384,014. Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable as obvious in view of Berg.

Reconsideration of the present application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 26 recites “placing the packing sleeve over the cylinder” and “placing the printing blanket or printing plate over the packing sleeve.” Claim 28 depends from claim 26 and further recites “wherein the printing blanket or printing plate is placed over the packing sleeve before the packing sleeve is placed over the cylinder.”

Claim 26 does not require or recite that “placing the packing sleeve over the cylinder” must occur before “placing the printing blanket or printing plate over the packing sleeve” as stated in the Final Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits claim 28 does not contradict claim 26 because the packing sleeve may be placed over the cylinder first and the printing blanket or plate may then be placed over the packing sleeve second or, alternatively, the printing blanket or plate may be placed over the packing sleeve first and the packing sleeve together with printing blanket or plate may then be placed over the cylinder second. Thus, claim 28 is consistent with claim 26 and further requires the additional limitation of “the printing blanket or printing plate [being] placed over the packing sleeve before the packing sleeve is placed over the cylinder.”

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, to claim 28 is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 11 to 14, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 24 to 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Berg, U.S. Patent No. 3,384,014.

Berg discloses a roller 10 having a cylindrical body 12 and a cut-out 13 on one side. A fabric backed rubber offset printing blanket or sheet 19 is fixed via beads 20, end bar members 21, 22, bolts 31 and ratchet device 16 to roller 10. (See col. 3, lines 1 to 52).

Claim 11 recites “[a] packing sleeve for a cylinder in a printing press, the packing sleeve being an intermediate sleeve for a printing plate or printing blanket comprising:

an evacuable structure of voids; and

an outer surface radially external to the voids for supporting the printing plate or printing blanket, the outer surface including at least one recess for fixing the printing plate or printing blanket.”

First, the blanket assembly 11 disclosed in Berg does not show or teach “a packing sleeve” or “sleeve” at all. The printing blanket or sheet 19 is a sheet or otherwise flat blanket attached to roller 10 via ratchet device 16, not a sleeve. There is no disclosure of sheet 19 being a sleeve. Thus, Berg simply does not disclose a “sleeve” or “a packing sleeve” as recited in claim 11.

Second, Berg does not teach or disclose “the packing sleeve being an intermediate sleeve for a printing plate or printing blanket” as recited in claim 11. As known in the printing arts, packing sleeves may be used to vary an effective diameter of a press cylinder. By applying a packing sleeve to a cylinder, a larger printing blanket or printing plate may be used in conjunction with the original cylinder despite a size mismatch. Berg discloses a roller 10 having a printing blanket or sheet 19 wrapped around and secured directly thereon. Berg does not disclose a “packing sleeve” between roller 10 and sheet 19 or a “packing sleeve being an intermediate sleeve for a printing plate or printing blanket” since blanket 19 is secured directly on roller 10 without an “intermediate sleeve.”

Third, the Final Office Action asserts that Berg discloses “a sleeve that is intermediate comprising one of the layers” on page 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Berg discloses, “a fabric backed rubber offset printing blanket or sheet 19.” (See col. 3 lines 19). The printing blanket or sheet 19 is not a “sleeve” and the fact that sheet 19 includes two materials, e.g. fabric and rubber, does not mean it is a “sleeve” or an “intermediate sleeve” as recited in claim 11.

Even if the Final Office Action were correct in asserting that one of the fabric backed rubber offset printing blanket or sheet layers was the claimed “intermediate sleeve” this layer, either the fabric or the rubber, would have to encompass each of the elements recited in claim 11

including “an evacuable structure of voids” and the “outer surface.” Berg simply does not teach or disclose this. Applicant respectfully submits this assertion is unsupported by the prior art and without merit.

Fourth, Berg does not teach or disclose “an evacuable structure of voids” as recited in claim 11. The Final Office Action points Applicant to the text in Berg disclosing bar halves 22b and slots 28a, 29a for support of the “evacuable structure of voids” limitation. Bar halves 22a are grooved to form slots 28a, 29a. Slots 28a, 29a receive beads 20 or a thickened end of sheet blanket 19. Bar halves 22a are not evacuable. As disclosed, slots 28a and 29a are grooved into bar halves 22a; slots 28a, 29a retain a constant geometry. The slots 28a, 29a themselves may be hollow or empty when a sheet 19 or bead 20 is not secured thereby, however, bar halves 22a cannot be evacuated of slots 28a, 29a. Thus, Berg does not teach or disclose “an evacuable structure of voids” as recited in claim 11.

Fifth, Berg does not disclose “an outer surface radially external to the voids for supporting the printing plate or printing blanket, the outer surface including at least one recess for fixing the printing plate or printing blanket.” Berg discloses a roller 10 having a cut-out 13. For support of this rejection the Final Office Action cites the “top of cut –out.” (See Final Office Action, page 3). Applicant respectfully submits that cut-out 13 does not have a top, it is open. Applicant further submits that cylindrical body 12 includes a cut-out 13 however, cylindrical body 12 and surfaces 14, 15 thereof are not “an outer surface radially external to the voids” as recited in claim 11. The Final Office Action does not identify such an “outer surface” in Berg.

Based on the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of claim 11 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

With respect to dependent claim 16, claim 16 further recites, “wherein the packing sleeve includes an inner surface having at least one recess or one projection.” Berg does not show or teach a “packing sleeve” for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11. In addition, Berg does not show or teach “an inner surface having at least one recess or one projection” as further required by claim 16 and the Final Office Action does not point to any support or disclosure in Berg to anticipate this claim. For this reason as well, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable for obvious over Berg.

Berg is discussed above.

Claim 22 recites “the voids are arranged in concentric groups at different distances from the center axis of the packing sleeve.”

Claim 23 recites “the voids in each group are located azimuthally offset with respect to adjacent voids in adjacent groups.”

The slots 28a, 29a in modified bar 22 and slots 28, 29 in bar 22 are designed in a particular fashion. Slots 28, 28a must be of sufficient size to receive beads 20 and throat slots 29, 29a, are only slightly larger than the thickness of blanket 19. (See col. 3, lines 46 and 47). The Final Office Action asserts that “because voids are disclosed by Berg, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select a location and number of voids depending on the desired bonding between the sleeve and the cylindrical body surrounded by the sleeve.” (See Page 4). The mere fact that Berg discloses slots is not sufficient motivation to modify the slots in such a way to provide slots 28, 28a, 29, 29a or groups of slots that are specifically “arranged in concentric groups at different distances from the center axis of the packing sleeve” and “located azimuthally offset with respect to adjacent voids in adjacent groups” as recited in claims 22 and 23. Applicant respectfully submits that the slots 28, 28a, 29, 29a are designed to accommodate the arrangement of bars 21, 22, beads 20 and sheet 19. Slots 28, 28a, 29, 29a are grooved into bars 22 so there arrangement is restricted and limited to the placement of the bars 22. Berg does not show or disclose the arrangement of voids recited in claims 22 and 23 or provide any motivation for this arrangement.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for these reasons is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,  
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:                     /William C. Gehris/                      
William C. Gehris  
(Reg. No. 38,156)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940